



EW
DAC

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: A8538

Ayman Hariri, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/873,433

Group Art Unit: 2614

Confirmation No.: 5154

Examiner: William Deane, Jr.

Filed: June 5, 2001

For: UNIVERSAL POINT OF CONTACT IDENTIFIER SYSTEM AND METHOD

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant petitions for the Examiner to consider certain references submitted on June 5, 2002 in the present application that the Examiner indicated he has not considered.

Further to a telephone call with Examiner Ken Wieder on December 12, 2007, Applicant re-submits, concurrently herewith, copies of those references the Examiner did not consider along with a PTO/SB/08 form listing those references. Applicant also submits evidence showing that those references were submitted with the IDS of June 5, 2002, and thus, should have been considered.

On June 5, 2002 Applicant submitted for the Examiner's consideration an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) along with 42 U.S. patent documents, 25 foreign patent documents and 20 other documents. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) received these patent documents on June 5, 2002 as evidenced by Applicant's filing receipt date stamped by the PTO. (Exhibit A) The filing receipt states that "Copies of 25 foreign patent documents" and "Copies

of 20 other documents” were submitted to the PTO on June 5, 2002. The PTO date-stamped the filing receipt acknowledging receipt of those documents.

Submitted along with the IDS and the references were five sheets of an Information Disclosure Citation Form. The Examiner returned these sheets of the Citation Form in which he indicated that he considered many of the references by placing his initials next to the descriptions of those references. (Exhibit B) However, on sheets 3, 4 and 5 of the Citation form the Examiner indicates that he did not consider many of the foreign patent documents and other documents that were submitted. Specifically, the Examiner indicates on sheets 3 and 4 of the Citation form that he did not consider 23 of the 25 foreign patent documents, and on sheet 5 he indicates that he did not consider 12 of the 20 other documents. The Examiner indicates this by crossing through the references he did not consider. Apparently the Examiner did not consider the references because he did not have copies of those references as indicated on the Citation form returned to the Applicant. However, Applicant submitted copies of all the 25 foreign patent documents and 20 other documents listed on the Citation form, as evidenced by the PTO-stamped filing receipt. Applicant also notes as further evidence of the PTO’s receipt of the references that the PTO date-stamped each of the sheets of the Citation form on June 5, 2002 further indicating receipt of all of the documents submitted on June 5, 2002. (See Exhibit B)

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the 23 foreign patent documents listed on sheets 3 and 4, and the 12 other documents listed on sheet 5 of the June 5, 2002 Citation form, that the Examiner had indicated he had not considered. Applicant submits, for the Examiner’s convenience, copies of those 23 foreign patent documents and 12 other documents

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.181
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/873,433

Attorney Docket No.: A8538

that the Examiner indicated he did not consider, along with a new PTO/SB/08 form listing each of those documents.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Warren Lytle, Jr./

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

J. Warren Lytle, Jr.
Registration No. 39,283

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 19, 2007